arXiv:1512.03500v1 [stat.ME] 11 Dec 2015

Multi-threshold Accelerate Failure Time Model

Baisuo Jin and Jialiang Li

Abstract

A two-stage procedure for simultaneously detecting multiple thresholds and achieving model selection in the segmented accelerate failure time (AFT) model is developed in this paper. In the first stage, we formulate the threshold problem as a group model selection problem so that a concave 2-norm group selection method can be applied. In the second stage, the thresholds are finalized via a refining method. We establish the strong consistency of the threshold estimates and regression coefficient estimates under some mild technical conditions. The proposed procedure performs satisfactorily in our extensive simulation studies. Its real world applicability is demonstrated via analyzing a follicular lymphoma data.

Keywords: AFT model, break points, group model selection, Stute estimator, threshold regression.

B. Jin is an Associate Professor of Department of Statistics and Finance, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui, China. J. Li is an Associate Professor of Department of Statistics and Applied Probability and Duke-NUS Graduate Medical School, National University of Singapore, as well as a Scientist in Singapore Eye Research Institute

1 Introduction

Applied economists routinely test their models for the presence of structural change. If the evidence supports it, a threshold model is constructed and one needs to detect the thresholds (also called break points) at which to split the sample. The threshold variable may be an element of regressors. One such example is the well-known threshold autoregressive model (see Tong, 2012). Sometimes the threshold variable is simply the index of observed samples (eg. time in a time series model) and the model is commonly referred to as the change point model or segmented regression (see Yao and Au, 1989, Perron, 2006, Fearnhead and Vasileiou, 2009).

In this paper we focus on the setting where multiple thresholds exist which is a much more challenging problem than a single break-point detection (Hansen, 2000). A number of issues arise in the presence of multiple change points. These include the determination of the number of breaks, estimation of the thresholds given the number, and statistical analysis of the resulting estimators. There exists a rich literature devoted to this field. For example, Inclan and Tiao (1994) identified multiple change-points of variance using the iterated cumulative sum of squares (ICSS) algorithm. Bai and Perron (2003) developed the dynamic programming principle for the estimation of multiple change-points in linear regression. Following the familiar idea of penalized estimation, Harchaoui and Lévy-Leduc (2010) used the least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) algorithm to estimate the locations of multiple change-points, in one-dimensional piecewise constant signals. Similarly, Davis et al. (2006) proposed a genetic algorithm to detect multiple break points, and Jin, Shi and Wu (2013) considered non-concave penalty functions including the smoothly clipped absolute deviation (SCAD) penalty and minimax concave penalty (MCP)

penalty in piecewise stationary autoregressive processes.

Very few authors considered the problem of estimating multiple thresholds for survival regression analysis. Censored lifetime data break down the usual estimation framework for completely observed data. We usually cannot attain a closed-form solution for regression estimates and therefore face an increased complexity of estimating thresholds accurately. To address this under-developed issue, we consider the accelerate failure time (AFT) model as a typical example of regression models in this paper and contribute a new methodology on change-point problem for survival data analysis.

The AFT model permits a direct assessment of the covariate effects on the survival time, facilitating the interpretation of regression coefficients for the mean response. There are many estimation methods available for AFT model in the literature, including Buckley and James (1979), Prentice (1978), Tsiatis (1990), Ying (1993), Lin, Wei and Ying (1998). Most of the estimation methods for right censored data are rank-based and in practice the estimating functions may be discontinuous, producing challenges to the computation. In particular, Stute (1993, 1996) proposed a weighted least squares estimator in AFT model, and established the consistency and asymptotic normality. Recently Huang, Ma and Xie (2006) carried out a variable selection procedure and estimation in AFT model with high-dimensional covariates based on Stute's estimator. In this paper, we formally adopt the Stute estimator to study the parameter estimation for the AFT model with s thresholds, where $s \geq 0$ is unspecified. Using a two-stage procedure proposed in this paper we may estimate the thresholds and the regression coefficients simultaneously. Interestingly our procedure may be straight forwardly extended to incorporate variable selection for high-dimensional data analysis.

The paper is arranged as follows. In Section 2, the multiple break-point problem for the

AFT model is formulated. We then propose a two-stage procedure to detect the thresholds and estimate model parameters. In Section 3, we establish theoretical properties of our procedure. Next simulation studies are conducted in Section 4 to examine the performance of our methods. An empirical application to a follicular lymphomais data is presented in Section 5.

Throughout the paper, $\underline{1}_q = (1, \ldots, 1)'$ is a q-dimensional constant vector, I_q is the $q \times q$ identity matrix, $1_{\{\cdot\}}$ is an indicator function, $\boldsymbol{A}'$ is the transpose of a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$, and $\lfloor c \rfloor$ is the integer part of a real number c. For a vector $\underline{a}$, $\underline{a}'$ is its transpose, a_j is its jth component, $|\underline{a}|$ and $\|\underline{a}\|$ are respectively its L_1-norm and L_2-norm. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a set, its complement and its size are denoted by $\mathcal{A}^c$ and $\sharp\mathcal{A}$, respectively. In addition, "$\rightarrow_{a.s.}$" denotes convergence with probability 1.

2 Methodology for multiple thresholds under AFT model

Let $t_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$ be the independent logarithm of the failure time and $\underline{x}_1, \ldots, \underline{x}_n$ are i.i.d. p-dimensional regressors. Assume $(t_i, \underline{x}_i), i = 1, \ldots, n$ satisfy the following AFT

model with s thresholds located at $a_1 < \ldots < a_s$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
t_i &= \sum_{j=1}^{s+1} \underline{x}_i' \underline{\beta}_j^* 1_{\{a_{j-1} < z_i \leq a_j\}} + \varepsilon_i \\
&= \underline{x}_i' \left[\underline{\beta}_1^* + \sum_{\ell=1}^{s} \underline{d}_\ell^* 1_{\{a_\ell < z_i \leqslant a_{s+1}\}} \right] + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n \\
&= \begin{cases} \underline{x}_i' \underline{\beta}_1^* + \varepsilon_i & \text{if } a_0 \leq z_i \leq a_1, \\ \underline{x}_i' (\underline{\beta}_1^* + \underline{d}_1^*) + \varepsilon_i & \text{if } a_1 < z_i \leq a_2, \\ \ldots & \ldots \\ \underline{x}_i' \left(\underline{\beta}_1^* + \sum_{\ell=1}^{s} \underline{d}_\ell^* \right) + \varepsilon_i, & \text{if } a_s < z_i \leq a_{s+1}, \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}
$$

where $\underline{\beta}_1^*, \ldots, \underline{\beta}_{s+1}^*$ are unknown p-dimensional regression coefficients for $s+1$ subgroups, $\underline{d}_\ell^* = \underline{\beta}_{\ell+1}^* - \underline{\beta}_\ell^*, \ell = 1, \ldots, s$, are the increments of coefficients between two adjacent subgroups, $s \geq 0$ is the unknown number of thresholds, z_i is the thresholding variable, $a_1, \ldots, a_s$ are unknown threshold locations, $a_0 = -\infty$, $a_{s+1} = \infty$, $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_n$ are independent random errors, and $\varepsilon_{a_{\ell-1}+1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{a_\ell}$ are identically distributed with mean zero and variance σ_ℓ^2, $\ell = 1, \ldots, s+1$. Notice that if $s = 0$, the model (2.1) does not involve threshold. If $s \geq 1$, we denote $P(z_i \leq a_j) = \tau_j, j = 1, \ldots, s$ where $0 < \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \ldots < \tau_s < 1$. If $z_i = i$, we retain the usual change point model, and the condition $P(z_i \leq a_j) = \tau_j$ will be replaced by $a_j/n \to \tau_j$ since change point locations actually depend on the sample size in this setting.

Let $c_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$ be the independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) logarithm of the censoring time. In practice we only observe $(y_i, \delta_i, \underline{x}_i), i = 1, \ldots, n$, where $y_i = \min(t_i, c_i)$ is the censored logarithm of the failure time and $\delta_i = 1_{\{t_i \leq c_i\}}$ is the censoring indicator.

Throughout this paper, let $y_{(1,\mathcal{I})} \leq \ldots \leq y_{(b,\mathcal{I})}$ be the order of $\{y_i : i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ where $\mathcal{I}$ is

an index set and $b = \sharp\mathcal{I}$. Let $\delta_{[\ell,\mathcal{I}]}$ be the concomitant of the ℓth-order $y_{(\ell,\mathcal{I})}, \ell = 1, \ldots, b$. Define the Kaplan-Meier weights as

$$w_{[1,\mathcal{I}]} = \frac{\delta_{[1,\mathcal{I}]}}{b}, w_{[\ell,\mathcal{I}]} = \frac{\delta_{[\ell,\mathcal{I}]}}{b-\ell+1} \prod_{k=1}^{\ell-1} \left(\frac{b-\ell-k}{b-\ell+1}\right)^{\delta_{[\ell,\mathcal{I}]}}, \qquad \ell = 2, \ldots, b.$$

Such weights are constructive elements of the Kaplan-Meier estimator for the survival function (See Lawless, 2011). Let $r_{y_i,\mathcal{I}} \in [1, b]$ be the rank of y_i among $\{y_i : i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ i.e. $y_i = y_{(r_{y_i,\mathcal{I}},\mathcal{I})}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$. For simplicity, we denote $y_{(r_{y_i,\mathcal{I}})} = y_{(r_{y_i,\mathcal{I}},\mathcal{I})} = y_i$ and $w_{[r_{y_i,\mathcal{I}}]} = w_{[r_{y_i,\mathcal{I}},\mathcal{I}]}$.

If $a_j, j = 1, \ldots, s$ are known, define $\mathcal{I}_j^* = \{i : a_{j-1} < z_i \leq a_j\}$ and $b_j^* = \sharp\mathcal{I}_j^*$, we can use the Stute estimator to fit the AFT model. The resulting estimator $\underline{\hat{\beta}}_1^*, \underline{\hat{d}}_1^*, \ldots, \underline{\hat{d}}_s^*$ may be represented by a weighted least squares estimator that minimizes

$$\sum_{j=1}^{s+1} \frac{b_j^*}{2n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j^*} w_{[r_{y_i,\mathcal{I}_j^*}]} \left(y_i - \underline{x}_i'(\underline{\beta}_1^* + \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \underline{d}_k^*) \right)^2 . \tag{2.2}$$

We note that the weights $\{w_{[r_{y_i,\mathcal{I}_j^*}]}\}$ depend on the order of the random failure times and hence the related asymptotic argument is not as standard as the independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) case in linear regression.

We intend to estimate s, a_1, ..., and a_s and then use the detected change point(s) to obtain the Stute estimator for regression coefficients. To this end, first we need to decide the total number of thresholds and the approximate distances between pairs of thresholds. After that we may proceed to determine the exact locations of thresholds. We propose a two-stage procedure in the following sections.

2.1 The Splitting Stage

First we split the data sequence into $q_n + 1$ segments where q_n tends to infinity as $n \to \infty$. Let $\{z_i : \delta_i = 1, i = 1, \ldots, n\} = \{\tilde{z}_1, \ldots, \tilde{z}_{n^*}\}$ where $n^* = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_i$ is the total number of events. In order to allow each segment to include enough failure event observations, the data sequence is split such that the first segment $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{i : z_i \leq \tilde{z}_{(n^*-q_n m)}\}$ involves $n^* - q_n m$ events, and each of the other q_n segments $\mathcal{I}_j = \{i : \tilde{z}_{(n^*-(q_n-j+2)m)} < z_i \leq \tilde{z}_{(n^*-(q_n-j+1)m)}\}, j = 2, \ldots, q_n + 1$ involve m events where $\tilde{z}_{(1)} \leq \tilde{z}_{(2)} \ldots \leq \tilde{z}_{(n^*)}$ are the order of $\{\tilde{z}_i : i = 1, \ldots, n^*\}$. Define $b_j = \sharp\mathcal{I}_j, j = 1, \ldots, q_n + 1$.

To select these intervals covering thresholds $\{a_j\}$, we propose a concave 2-norm group selection method, such that an estimate $\hat{\underline{\theta}} = ((\hat{\underline{\beta}}_1)', (\hat{\underline{d}}_1)', \ldots, (\hat{\underline{d}}_{q_n})')'$ is given by minimizing

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q_n+1} \frac{b_j}{2n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_j} w_{[r_{y_i,\mathcal{I}_j}]} \left(y_i - \underline{x}_i'(\underline{\beta}_1 + \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \underline{d}_k) \right)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{q_n} p_{\lambda_n,\gamma_n}(\|\underline{d}_k\|), \tag{2.3}$$

where $\lambda_n > 0$, $\gamma_n > 1$ are tuning parameter, and the penalty function $p_{\lambda_n,\gamma_n}(|u|) > 0$ is concave in $|u|$. For the simplicity of presentation, we shall only consider two well-studied penalty functions in this paper, namely the smoothly clipped absolute deviation (SCAD) penalty and the minimax concave penalty (MCP). SCAD was introduced in Fan and Li (2001) and defined as $p_{\lambda,\gamma}(u) = \lambda u I_{[0,\,\lambda]}(u) + \frac{\gamma\lambda u - 0.5(u^2+\lambda^2)}{\gamma-1} I_{(\lambda,\,\gamma\lambda]}(u) + \frac{\lambda^2(\gamma^2-1)}{2(\gamma-1)} I_{(\gamma\lambda,\,\infty)}(u), \gamma > 1$. MCP was introduced in Zhang (2010) and defined as $p_{\lambda,\gamma}(u) = (\lambda u - \frac{u^2}{2\gamma}) I_{[0,\,\gamma\lambda]}(u) + \frac{1}{2}\gamma\lambda^2 I_{(\gamma\lambda,\,\infty)}(u), \gamma > 2$.

Let $\underline{y}_{(j)} = (y_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_j)'$, $\mathbf{X}_{(j)} = (\underline{x}_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_j)'$, $\underline{\tilde{w}}_{(j)} = b_j(w_{[r_{y_i,\mathcal{I}_j}]}, i \in \mathcal{I}_j)'$, $\underline{\tilde{y}}_{(j)} = diag(\underline{\tilde{w}}_{(j)})^{1/2}\underline{y}_{(j)}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{(j)} = diag(\underline{\tilde{w}}_{(j)})^{1/2}\mathbf{X}_{(j)}$, $j = 1, \ldots, q_n+1$. Denote $\underline{\tilde{y}} = (\underline{\tilde{y}}'_{(1)}, \ldots, \underline{\tilde{y}}'_{(q_n+1)})'$, $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(1)}, \ldots, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(q_n+1)})$ where $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(1)} = (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(1)}, \ldots, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(q_n+1)})'$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(j)} = (\mathbf{0}_{p\times n_{m,j-1}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(j)}, \ldots,$

$\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(q_n+1)})'$, $j = 2. \ldots, q_n + 1$. The estimator $\hat{\underline{\theta}}$ in (2.3) can be written as

$$\hat{\underline{\theta}} = \arg\min_{\underline{\theta}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2n} \|\tilde{\underline{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\underline{\theta}\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{q_n} p_{\lambda_n,\gamma_n}(\|\underline{d}_j\|) \right\}, \tag{2.4}$$

In the paper, we apply the group coordinate descent (GCD) algorithm to estimate $\hat{\theta}_n$ from (2.4).

The properties of $\hat{\theta}$ will be given by Theorem 3.2 in the next section. For simplicity, we write $\hat{\underline{\theta}} = ((\hat{\underline{\theta}}_1)', \ldots, (\hat{\underline{\theta}}_{q_n+1})')'$ such that $\hat{\underline{\theta}}_1 = \hat{\underline{\beta}}_1$ and $\hat{\underline{\theta}}_j = \hat{\underline{d}}_{j-1}$, $j = 2, \ldots, q_n + 1$. Let $\hat{\mathcal{A}} = \{j : \hat{\underline{\theta}}_j \neq 0, j = 1, \ldots, q_n + 1\}$, and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^*$ be a subset of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^* = \{j : j \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}, j - 1 \notin \hat{\mathcal{A}}, j = 2, \ldots, q_n + 1\} = \{\hat{k}_1, \ldots, \hat{k}_{\hat{s}}\}$. If $\hat{s} = 0$, we declare there is no threshold. If $\hat{s} > 0$, by Theorem 3.2, the true threshold a_j is highly likely to be located in $(\tilde{z}_{(n^*-(q_n-\hat{k}_j+3)m)}, \tilde{z}_{(n^*-(q_n-\hat{k}_j+1)m)}]$, $j = 1, \ldots, \hat{s}$.

2.2 The Refining Stage

If $\hat{s} > 0$, by Theorem 3.2, we can estimate the threshold a_j in $(\tilde{z}_{(n^*-(q_n-\hat{k}_j+3)m)}$, $\tilde{z}_{(n^*-(q_n-\hat{k}_j+1)m)}]$. To obtain the estimates of the thresholds $\{a_j\}$, we denote $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_j = \{i : \tilde{z}_{(n^*-(q_n-\hat{k}_j+3)m)} < z_i \leq \tilde{z}_{(n^*-(q_n-\hat{k}_j+1)m)}\}$, $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_{j,\varsigma^-} = \{i : \tilde{z}_{(n^*-(q_n-\hat{k}_j+3)m)} < z_i \leq \varsigma\}$, $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_{j,\varsigma^+} = \{i : \varsigma < z_i \leq \tilde{z}_{(n^*-(q_n-\hat{k}_j+1)m)}\}$

$$\begin{aligned} Q_j(\varsigma^-, \underline{\beta}) &= \frac{\sharp\hat{\mathcal{I}}_{j,\varsigma^-}}{\sharp\hat{\mathcal{I}}_j} \sum_{i \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}_{j,\varsigma^-}} w_{[r_{y_i,\hat{\mathcal{I}}_{j,\varsigma^-}}]}(y_i - \underline{x}_i'\underline{\beta})^2, \\ Q_j(\varsigma^+, \underline{\beta}) &= \frac{\sharp\hat{\mathcal{I}}_{j,\varsigma^+}}{\sharp\hat{\mathcal{I}}_j} \sum_{i \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}_{j,\varsigma^+}} w_{[r_{y_i,\hat{\mathcal{I}}_{j,\varsigma^+}}]}(y_i - \underline{x}_i'\underline{\beta})^2, \end{aligned}$$

and use the following method to estimate a_j:

$$\hat{a}_j = \text{argmin}_{\varsigma \in (\tilde{z}_{(n^*-(q_n-\hat{k}_j+3)m)}, \tilde{z}_{(n^*-(q_n-\hat{k}_j+1)m)}] \bigcap \{z_{(1)},\ldots,z_{(n)}\}} \{Q_j(\varsigma)\}, \tag{2.5}$$

where $Q_j(\varsigma) = \min_{\underline{\beta}} Q_j(\varsigma^-, \underline{\beta}) + \min_{\underline{\beta}} Q_j(\varsigma^+, \underline{\beta})$, $j = 1, \ldots, \hat{s}$, and $z_{(1)} \leq z_{(2)} \ldots \leq z_{(n)}$ are the order of $z_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$. The regions separated by the thresholds achieve the overall minimum least squares errors. The consistency of $\hat{a}_j$ will be provided in Theorem 3.3.

2.3 Remarks

We refer to the proposed two-stage procedure as *T*wo *S*tage *M*ultiple *C*hange-points *D*etection (TSMCD) from now on. Since two regularization methods, i.e. MCP, and SCAD, will be utilized in the splitting stage, we refer to the corresponding TSMCD as TSMCD(MCP) and TSMCD(SCAD), respectively.

After we obtain $\hat{a}_j, j = 1, \ldots, \hat{s}$ by TSMCD, it is sensible to use the weighted least squares to obtain a final estimate of the coefficients in model (2.1). Let $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_j^* = \{i : \hat{a}_{j-1} < z_i \leq \hat{a}_j\}$ and $\hat{b}_j^* = \sharp\hat{\mathcal{I}}_j^*$, $j = 1, \ldots, \hat{s}+1$ where $\hat{a}_0 = -\infty$ and $\hat{a}_{\hat{s}+1} = +\infty$. Then the coefficient $\underline{\theta}^* = ((\underline{\beta}_1^*)', (\underline{d}_1^*)', \ldots, (\underline{d}_s^*)')' = (\theta_1^*, \ldots, \theta_{p(s+1)}^*)'$ can be estimated by minimizing the following penalized least squares

$$M(\underline{\theta}) = \sum_{j=1}^{\hat{s}_n+1} \frac{\hat{b}_j^*}{2n} \sum_{i \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}_j^*} w_{[r_{y_i,\hat{\mathcal{I}}_j^*}]} \left(y_i - \underline{x}_i'(\underline{\beta}_1 + \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \underline{d}_k) \right)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{p(\hat{s}_n+1)} p_{\lambda_n,\gamma_n}(|\theta_i|), \tag{2.6}$$

where the penalty function $p_{\lambda_n,\gamma_n}(|u|) > 0$ is the same as in (2.4) and $\underline{\theta} = ((\underline{\beta}_1)', (\underline{d}_1)', \ldots, (\underline{d}_{\hat{s}})')'$ $= (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{p(\hat{s}+1)})'$. The inclusion of the panalty functions may lead to a sparse solution since the number of parameters could be quite large for all the subgroups. The oracle property of $\hat{\underline{\theta}}^* = \arg\min_{\underline{\theta}} M(\underline{\theta})$ will be given by Theorem 3.3.

Similar to Jin, Shi and Wu (2013), γ_n is set as 2.4 for SCAD and MCP penalties in the TSMCD. The regularization parameter λ_n can be chosen by the Bayesian information criterion (BIC).

The performance of TSMCD is further dependent on the segment length m. The selection of an optimal m can be carried out as follows: Apply the spliting stage to the data sequence L times with the common segment length of events (excluding the first segment) m_ℓ, $\ell = 1, \ldots, L$. In order to meet the assumption, i.e., $m = \lfloor c\sqrt{n} \rfloor$ made in Theorem 3.2, we set $m_\ell = \lfloor \kappa_\ell \sqrt{n} \rfloor$, $\ell = 1, \ldots, L$, where κ_ℓ takes values from L grid-points in an interval, say [0.1, 2.0]. For each m_ℓ, applying TSMCD, we obtain the set of estimated thresholds $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_\ell = \{\hat{a}_{1,\ell}, \ldots, \hat{a}_{\hat{s}_\ell,\ell}\}$, $\ell = 1, \ldots, L$. We use the BIC to choose the best index

$$\hat{\ell} = \text{argmin}_{\ell=1,\ldots,L} \left\{ BIC_{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_\ell} \right\}, \tag{2.7}$$

where

$$BIC_{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_\ell} = n \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\hat{s}_\ell+1} \frac{\sharp \hat{\mathcal{I}}_{j,\ell}}{n} \left(\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \sum_{i \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}_{j,\ell}} w_{[r_{y_i, \hat{\mathcal{I}}_{j,\ell}}]} (y_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta})^2 \right) \right) + q(\hat{s}_\ell + 1) \log(n) \tag{2.8}$$

with $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_{j,\ell} = \{i : \hat{a}_{j-1,\ell} < z_i \leq \hat{a}_{j,\ell}\}$, $\hat{a}_{0,\ell} = -\infty, \hat{a}_{\hat{s}_\ell+1,\ell} = +\infty$. The optimal $m_{opt} = \lfloor \kappa_{\hat{\ell}} \sqrt{n} \rfloor$.

3 Asymptotic theory

Under model (2.1), we further denote the distributions of $\{t_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_j^*\}$ and $\{y_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_j^*\}$ to be F_j and H_j, $j = 1, \ldots, s+1$. Denote the distribution of log censoring times $\{c_1, \ldots, c_n\}$

by G. We define U_{F_j}, U_{H_j} and U_G to be the least upper bound for the support of F_j, H_j and G, respectively.

Throughout the paper the following assumption will be made:

(A1) $P(z_i \leq a_j) = \tau_j$ where $0 < \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \ldots < \tau_s < 1$, $E(\varepsilon_i|\underline{x}_i) = 0$, $E(t_i^2) < \infty$, $E(\underline{x}_i\underline{x}_i') = \Sigma_0$ is finite and nonsingular, and z_i and ε_i are independent, $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

(A2) t_i and c_i are independent, H_j is continuous, and $P(t_i \leq c_i|t_i, \underline{x}_i) = P(t_i \leq c_i|t_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $j = 1, \ldots, s+1$.

(A3) $U_{F_j} < \tau_G$ or $U_{F_j} = U_G = \infty$.

Assumption (A1) allows heteroscedastic error. For example, we may relax the error assumption to be $\varepsilon_i = \sigma(\underline{x}_i'\underline{\beta}_j^*)\varepsilon_i^*$ where ε_i^* is independent with $\underline{x}_i$ and $\varepsilon_1^*, \ldots, \varepsilon_n^*$ are i.i.d. with mean zero and variance σ^2. (A2) assumes that δ_i is conditionally independent of $\underline{x}_i$ given t_i. (A3) implies that $U_{H_j} = U_{F_j}$.

We first present a result for the simple case where $s = 1$. Tentatively we rewrite a_1 and $\underline{d}_1^*$ as a and $\underline{d}^*$, respectively, in model (2.1), and replace τ_1 with τ in assumption (A1) for simplicity.

Theorem 3.1 *Assume conditions (A1)-(A3) hold for model (2.1) and* $\|\underline{d}^*\| > 0$, *then we have* $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n 1_{\{z_i \leq \hat{a}\}} \to_{a.s.} \tau$ *as* $n \to \infty$. *Furthermore, if* z_i *is a continuous random variable, we have* $\hat{a} \to_{a.s.} a$; *if* $z_i = i$, *we have* $\hat{a}/n \to_{a.s.} \tau$.

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is given in the Appendix. The result itself may be of interest since many econometric studies deal with a single change point.

If $s \geq 0$ is unknown, we use the proposed FTSMCD to estimate s, and the change points $a_j, j = 1, \ldots, s$ when $s > 0$. The following technical conditions are also needed:

(A4) $m = \lfloor n^*/(q_n + 1) \rfloor = \lfloor \kappa\sqrt{n^*} \rfloor$, where $\kappa > 0$ is a constant.

(A5) The penalty function $p_{\lambda_n,\gamma_n}(|u|)$ of (2.4) satisfies $p_{\lambda_n,\gamma_n}(0) = 0$, $p'_{\lambda_n,\gamma_n}(u) = 0$ if $u > \gamma_n\lambda_n$, $p'_{\lambda_n,\gamma_n}(0) = \lambda_n$, $\lambda_n \to 0$ and $\lambda_n\sqrt{n}/\log n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

(A6) $\varepsilon_i = \sigma(\underline{x}_i'\underline{\beta}_j^*)\varepsilon_i^*, i \in \mathcal{I}_j^*, j = 1, \ldots, s+1$, ε_i^* is independent of $\underline{x}_i$, $\varepsilon_1^*, \ldots, \varepsilon_n^*$ are i.i.d. random errors with distribution F_0. Suppose $\tau_{F_0} < \tau_{F_j}$, and there exists some $\tau_{F_j}^* < \tau_{F_j} - \tau_{F_0}$, such that $\sigma(\underline{x}_i'\underline{\beta}_j^*) = 0$ if $\underline{x}'\underline{\beta}_j^* > \tau_{F_j}^*$, otherwise $\sigma(\underline{x}_i'\underline{\beta}_j^*) = 1$, $j = 1, \ldots, s+1$.

Assumption (A4) ensure that there is at most one threshold for each segment for large n. Both SCAD and MCD satisfy the penalty assumption (A5). (A6) implies $t_i = \underline{x}_i'\underline{\beta}_j^*$ if $\tau_{F_j}^* + \tau_{F_0} < y_i \leq \tau_{F_j}$.

Define $\mathcal{A}^* = \{i_1, \ldots, i_a\}$ to be the group index set, $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*} = (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(i_1)}, \ldots, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(i_a)})$ and $\underline{\tilde{y}}_{\mathcal{A}^*} = (\underline{\tilde{y}}'_{(i_1)}, \ldots, \underline{\tilde{y}}'_{(i_a)})'$. Similarly we can define $\underline{\hat{\theta}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}$ and $\underline{\hat{\theta}}_{(\mathcal{A}^*)^c}$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{1, k_{j,n}, k_{j,n} + 1 : j = 1, \ldots, s\}$.

Theorem 3.2 *If Assumptions (A1)-(A6) hold,* $\min\{||\underline{\beta}_1^*||, ||\underline{d}_1^*||, \ldots, ||\underline{d}_s^*||\} > 2\sqrt{p}\gamma\lambda_n$, *and* $\underline{\hat{\theta}}$ *satisfies* $\underline{\hat{\theta}}_{\mathcal{A}^*} = (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{\mathcal{A}^*}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*})^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}\underline{\tilde{y}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}$, $\underline{\hat{\theta}}_{(\mathcal{A}^*)^c} = \underline{0}$, *where*

$$\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq \mathcal{A} \text{ and } 1 \in \mathcal{A}^*, k_{\ell,n} \in \mathcal{A}^* \text{ or } k_{\ell,n} + 1 \in \mathcal{A}^* \text{ for all } \ell = 1, \ldots, s, \tag{3.1}$$

then we have $\underline{\hat{\theta}}$ *is the solution of (2.4) with probability 1.*

The proof of Theorem 3.2 is given in Appendix. Theorem 3.2 provides the existence of the solution of (2.4). In this theorem, $\mathcal{A}^*$ is the group index set of no-zero group elements of $\underline{\hat{\theta}}$. By (3.1), $\mathcal{A}^*$ is not unique and may take 2^s possibile forms.

Let $\underline{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_s)'$. Similar to the definition of $\underline{\tilde{y}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}$, we may define $\underline{\tilde{y}}_{(\underline{a})}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{(\underline{a})}$. By Assumption (A1), we have $\frac{1}{n}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(\underline{a})}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{(\underline{a})} \to_{a.s} \Gamma > 0$.

To obtain the limiting property of $\hat{\underline{\theta}}^*$ in (2.6), we will further need the following assumption:

(A7) $\max_{u\geq 0}\{p''_{\lambda_n,\gamma_n}(u)\} + \lambda_{(s+1)p}(\Gamma) > 0$ where $\lambda_{(s+1)p}(\Gamma)$ is the minimal eigenvalue of Γ.

For MCP, (A7) is equivalent to $\lambda_{(s+1)p}(\Gamma) > 1/\gamma$, and for SCAD, (A7) is equivalent to $\lambda_{(s+1)p}(\Gamma) > 1/(\gamma - 1)$. Let $(\theta^*_1, \ldots, \theta^*_{(s+1)p})' = ((\underline{\beta}^*_1)', (\underline{d}^*_1)', \ldots, (\underline{d}^*_s)')'$ and $\mathcal{S} = \{j : \theta^*_j \neq 0, j = 1, \ldots, (s+1)p\}$.

Theorem 3.3 *Under the Assumptions (A1)-(A7),* $\min_{j\in S}\{|\theta_j|\} > \gamma\lambda_n$, $\hat{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}^*$ *satisfies (3.1),* $\hat{\underline{a}} = (\hat{a}_1, \ldots, \hat{a}_s)'$ *is obtained by (2.5), and* $\hat{\underline{\theta}}^*$ *is given by (2.6), then we have, with probability 1,*

(i) $\sum_{i=1}^n 1_{\{z_i \leq \hat{a}_j\}}/n \to \tau_j, j = 1, \ldots, s$;

(ii) $\hat{\underline{\theta}}^* = \hat{\underline{\theta}}^o$,

where $\hat{\underline{\theta}}^o = \arg\min_{\underline{\theta}}\{\|\underline{\tilde{y}}_{(\underline{a})} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{(\underline{a})}\underline{\theta}\|^2 : \underline{\theta} = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{(s+1)p})', \theta_j = 0 \ \forall \ j \notin \mathcal{S}\}$ *is the oracle estimator when thresholds and the set* $\mathcal{S}$ *are known.*

The proof of Theorem 3.3 is given in Appendix. We attain the consistency of the FTSMCD estimators in this theorem. Our estimators work as well as the oracle estimators in large samples.

4 Simulation Study

We generate random samples from model (2.1) with $s = 2$ change points in the following. Specifically, we generate the regressors $\underline{x}_i = (x_{1,i}, x_{2,i}, \ldots, x_{6,i})'$ with $x_{1,i} = 1$, $x_{j,i} \sim N(0,1), j = 2, \ldots, 6$, and $\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, 0.5)$. We specify the coefficients $(\theta_1^*, \ldots, \theta_{18}^*)' = ((\underline{\beta}_1^*)', (\underline{d}_1^*)', (\underline{d}_2^*)')' = (2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, -1, 0, 0, -1, -1, -1, 0, -1, 1, 0, 0, 0)'$, the thresholding variable $z_i = x_{2,i}$, and true thresholds $a_1 = -0.5244$, $a_2 = 0.2533$. The two thresholds are the 30% and 60% lower percentiles of the standard normal distribution. We design the following three cases:

Example 1: sample size $n = 150$ and censoring variable $c_i \sim N(2, 16)$;

Example 2: sample size $n = 300$ and censoring variable $c_i \sim N(2, 16)$;

Example 3: sample size $n = 300$ and censoring variable $c_i \sim N(\sum_{j=2}^{6} x_{j,i}, 16)$.

The censoring rates are about 40% for all cases. Assumption (A2) stipulates that t_i and c_i must be independent. This assumption is satisfied in the first two examples. However, a more realistic assumption is that t_i and c_i are conditionally independent given $\underline{x}_i$. Example 3 is thus introduced to test the robustness of our method.

We first report the estimation results for s in Table 1. Our methods can correctly identity the number of thresholds with very high probability. While their performance is comparable, SCAD seems to identify slightly more unnecessary change points than MCP. Both methods improve as sample size increases.

Figure 1 displays the histograms of the estimators of thresholds, indicating the empirical estimates are symmetrically distributed around the true change points. Table 2 summarizes the estimation performance of the estimated thresholds for the cases with correct estimation of $\hat{s} = 2$. Again the two penalty methods give quite similar results. The estimation bias

and mean squared error for a_1 are relatively smaller than those for a_2. In fact we note that the jumps at the two change points are $\|\underline{d}_1^*\|^2 = 4$ and $\|\underline{d}_2^*\|^2 = 2$, respectively, under our model. In general it is easier for our methods to detect a break point with greater jump.

Table 1: Frequency of estimated $\hat{s}$ in 1000 simulations. True number of change points $s = 2$.

	TSMCP-MCP							TSMCP-SCAD				
$\hat{s}$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5
Example 1	2	150	778	65	4	1	0	153	773	70	4	0
Example 2	0	13	919	64	3	0	1	12	869	116	3	0
Example 3	0	8	937	52	3	0	0	8	916	71	4	1

Table 2: Estimation performance for the threshold estimation. Bias is the average of estimated parameter minus the true value. RMSE refers to the relative mean squared errors.

	TSMCP-MCP				TSMCP-SCAD			
	$\hat{a}_1$		$\hat{a}_2$		$\hat{a}_1$		$\hat{a}_2$	
	Bias	RMSE	Bias	RMSE	Bias	RMSE	Bias	RMSE
Example 1	-0.014	0.031	0.037	0.476	-0.013	0.037	0.039	0.428
Example 2	-0.007	0.007	0.010	0.171	-0.008	0.007	0.012	0.158
Example 3	-0.009	0.006	0.008	0.145	-0.007	0.006	0.010	0.159

Finally we report the estimation performance of the regression coefficients $\hat{\theta}_j$ using box-plots in Figure 2. The estimated coefficients are quite consistent to the true parameter



Figure 1: Histograms of the estimated thresholds. The results for MCP and SCAD are displayed in the first and the second row, respectively. Examples 1, 2, and 3 are from the left to the right, respectively.

values. We can see that the variances of $\hat{\theta}_j^*, j = 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 14$, which are the estimators of the coefficients of the intercept $x_{1,i}$ and $x_{2,i} = z_i$, are larger than the others. The zero coefficients $\theta_j^*, j = 8, 9, 13, 16, 17, 18$, can be successfully selected by our method, suggesting a satisfactory variable selection performance.

It is noted in all simulations that results from Example 3 are comparable to those from Example 2. Even though example 3 violates the independence censoring assumption,

numerical results in this section suggest our methods are quite robust and may still work under conditional independence.

5 Real data analysis

Follicular lymphoma is the second most common form of non-Hodgkins lymphoma, accounting for about 22determine whether the survival risks of patients with follicular lymphoma can be predicted by the gene-expression profiles of tumors and standard clinical risk factors at diagnosis (Dave et al. (2004)). Fresh-frozen tumor-biopsy specimens and clinical data from 191 untreated patients who had received a diagnosis of follicular lymphoma between 1974 and 2001 were obtained. The median age at diagnosis was 51 years (range 23-81), and the median follow-up time was 6.6 years (range: less than 1.0-28.2). The median follow-up time among patients alive at last follow-up was 8.1 years. Eight records with missing survival information are excluded from the analysis.

A total of 156 subjects are included in analysis. Affymetrix U133A and U133B microarray gene-chips were used to measure gene-expression levels. A log2 transformation was first applied to the Affymetrix measurements. As genes with higher variations are of more interest, we filter the 44928 gene-expression measurements with the following criteria: (1) the max expression value of each gene across 156 samples must be greater than the median max expressions; and (2) the max-min expressions should be greater than their median. 6506 out of 44928 genes pass the above unsupervised screening.

Many authors analyzed this data in earlier works. We re-visit this data set in this section and consider an AFT model between the failure time and 5 most significant genetic markers

selected in Yu et al. (2012). According to Yu et al. (2012), genes 357, 2345, 6267, 6271, and 3653 are most important markers for the survival risk prediction when clinical information is adjusted. We thus set $x_{1,i} = 1$ as the intercept, chose the five gene expressions as the regressors $x_{2,i}, \ldots, x_{6,i}$, and let $z_i = x_{2,i}$ be the index variable. Applying TSMCD(MCP) and TSMCD(SCAD), we obtain the same estimation results, yielding two thresholds $\hat{a}_1 = -0.483$ and $\hat{a}_2 = 0.907$.

These two change points divide the sample into three groups with cumulative group sizes $\hat{\tau}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{156} 1_{\{z_i \le -0.483\}}/156 = 0.263$, and $\hat{\tau}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{156} 1_{\{z_i \le 0.907\}}/156 = 0.814$. Figure 3 displays the Kaplan Meier survival curves for the three groups separated by genes 357. The survival curves for Group 3 drops rapidly since the baseline and represents a high-risk group in this sample. Such an observation is not available without considering the threshold AFT model in this paper. Practitioners may adapt our model easily to discover more meaningful sub-populations with defining features. The BIC value is -124.487.

The estimated regression coefficients are $\hat{\underline{\theta}}^* = ((\hat{\underline{\beta}}_1^*)', (\hat{\underline{d}}_1^*)', (\hat{\underline{d}}_2^*)')'$ where $\hat{\underline{\beta}}_1^* = (0.791, -0.492, 0.291, 0.990, -0.589, 1.115)'$, $\hat{\underline{d}}_1^* = (1.166, 0, -0.451, -1.055, 0.540, -0.991)'$, $\hat{\underline{d}}_2^* = (0, -0.381, 0, 0, 0, 0.770)'$. Such results suggest at the first threshold $\hat{a}_1 = -0.483$, only the coefficient of $x_{2,i}$ does not change; and at the second threshold $\hat{a}_2 = 0.907$, only coefficients of $x_{2,i}$ and $x_{6,j}$ change and all other coefficients remain the same.

Using the identified break point struacture, we refitted the AFT model and reported the estimation results for the three sub-groups in Table 3, along with 95% bootstrap confidence intervals (Huang et al. (2006)). The effects of genes on the survival outcome are quite different for the three groups. For example, Gene 2345 is not significant for the first group but are negatively associated with the mortality for the other two groups. Using our empirical findings, investigators may evalute the importance of various genetic biomarkers

more specifically for different sub-populations.

Table 3: Estimates of regression coefficients for the three groups, along with bootstrap standard errors (S.E.) and P-values by Wald test.

	$z \leq -0.482$			$-0.482 < z \leq 0.907$			$z > 0.907$		
Covariates	Coef.	S.E.	P-value	Coef.	S.E.	P-value	Coef.	S.E.	P-value
Intercept	0.791	0.507	0.056	1.957	0.083	0	1.957	0.083	0
Gene 357	-0.492	0.179	0.003	-0.492	0.179	0.003	-0.874	0.144	6e-10
Gene 2345	0.291	0.627	0.321	-0.159	0.084	0.029	-0.159	0.084	0.029
Gene 6267	0.990	0.725	0.086	-0.065	0.110	0.277	-0.065	0.110	0.277
Gene 6271	-0.589	0.568	0.150	-0.049	0.120	0.341	-0.049	0.120	0.341
Gene 3653	1.115	0.556	0.022	0.124	0.078	0.056	0.894	0.250	2e-4

6 Discussion

Our penalization approaches can easily incorporate high-dimensional data analysis. Not many authors examined the change point problem under such settings and therefore the results in this paper could contribute significantly towards this goal. However, when the dimension of feature space is ultra high with an exponential order of the sample size, sually a screening step must be conducted before the application of penalization estimation. The detailed methodology is beyond the scope of this paper. We will carry out necessary theoretical and empirical studies for this topic.

Appendix

Matrix representation of model (2.1)

Let $\mathcal{C}_i = \bigcup_{j=i}^{q_n+1} \mathcal{I}_j$, $i = 1, \ldots, q_n + 1$. We split the segment $\mathcal{I}_{k_{j,n}}$ into two segments: $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}_{k_{j,n}} = \{i : \tilde{z}_{(n^*-(q_n-k_{j,n}+2)m))} < z_i \leq a_j\}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(2)}_{k_{j,n}} = \{i : a_j < z_i \leq \tilde{z}_{(n^*-(q_n-k_{j,n}+1)m))}\}$. We rewrite the model (2.1) as the following linear regression model that takes the segmentation of the data sequence into consideration:

$$\begin{aligned} t_i &= \underline{x}_i' \left[\underline{\beta}_1^* + \sum_{j=1}^{s} (1-\alpha_j) \underline{d}_j^* 1_{\{i \in \mathcal{C}_{k_{j,n}+1}\}} + \sum_{j=1}^{s} \alpha_j \underline{d}_j^* 1_{\{i \in \mathcal{C}_{k_{j,n}}\}} \right], \\ &+ \underline{x}_i' \left[\sum_{j=1}^{s} (1-\alpha_j) \underline{d}_j^* 1_{\{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(2)}_{k_{j,n}}\}} - \sum_{j=1}^{s} \alpha_j \underline{d}_j^* 1_{\{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}_{k_{j,n}}\}} \right] + \varepsilon_i, \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

where $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $\underline{d}_j^* = \underline{\beta}_{j+1}^* - \underline{\beta}_j^*$, $j = 1, \ldots, s$. It's noted that α_j, $j = 1, \ldots, s$, can take any values since they can be cancelled out in (A.1). To include them in (A.1) is to facilitate the proof of Theorem 3.2. In order to estimate $k_{j,n}$, $j = 1, \ldots, s$ and the regression coefficients simultaneously, we expand the model (A.1) as the following model:

$$t_i = \underline{x}_i' \left[\underline{\beta}_1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_n} \underline{d}_\ell 1_{\{i \in \mathcal{C}_{\ell+1}\}} + \underline{\omega}_i \right] + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{A.2}$$

where $\{\underline{d}_\ell\}$ and $\{\underline{\omega}_i\}$ are defined as follows:

$$\underline{d}_\ell = \begin{cases} \alpha_j \underline{d}_j^*, & \ell = k_{j,n} - 1,\ j = 1, \ldots, s \\ (1-\alpha_j)\underline{d}_j^*, & \ell = k_{j,n},\ j = 1, \ldots, s \\ \underline{0}_p, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

$$\underline{\omega}_i = \begin{cases} -\alpha_j \underline{d}_j^*, & i \in \mathcal{I}^{(1)}_{k_{j,n}},\ j = 1, \ldots, s \\ (1-\alpha_j)\underline{d}_j^*, & i \in \mathcal{I}^{(2)}_{k_{j,n}},\ j = 1, \ldots, s \\ \underline{0}_p, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\underline{\varepsilon}_{(j)} = (\varepsilon_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_j)'$, $\underline{x}_{\omega,(j)} = (\underline{x}_i'\underline{\omega}_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_j)'$, $\tilde{\underline{\varepsilon}}_{(j)} = diag(\underline{\tilde{w}}_{(j)})^{1/2}\underline{\varepsilon}_{(j)}$, $\underline{\tilde{x}}_{\omega,(j)} = diag(\underline{\tilde{w}}_{(j)})^{1/2}\underline{x}_{\omega,(j)}$, $\tilde{\underline{\varepsilon}} = (\underline{\varepsilon}'_{(1)}, \ldots, \underline{\varepsilon}'_{(q_n+1)})'$, $\underline{\tilde{x}}_\omega = (\underline{x}'_{\omega,(1)}, \ldots, \underline{x}'_{\omega,(q_n+1)})'$, $\underline{\theta}^* = (\underline{\theta}'_1, \ldots, \underline{\theta}'_{q_n+1})' = (\underline{\beta}'_1, \underline{d}'_1, \ldots, \underline{d}'_{q_n})'$ and $\underline{d}_j = (d_{j1}, \ldots, d_{jp})'$, $j = 1, \ldots, q_n$. The model (A.2) has the matrix form as follows:

$$\underline{\tilde{y}} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\underline{\theta}^* + \underline{\tilde{x}}_\omega + \tilde{\underline{\varepsilon}}, \tag{A.3}$$

Remove the zero elements of $\underline{\theta}^*$, model (A.3) can be rewritten as

$$\underline{\tilde{y}} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}}\underline{\theta}^*_{\mathcal{A}} + \underline{\tilde{x}}_\omega + \tilde{\underline{\varepsilon}}, \tag{A.4}$$

which corresponds to the matrix form of model (A.1).

Proof of Theorem 3.1

Proof.

Let $\varsigma = z_{(k)}$, $\underline{y}_{1k} = (y_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_{z^-_{(k)}})'$, $\mathbf{X}_{1k} = (\underline{x}_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_{z^-_{(k)}})'$, $\underline{\varepsilon}_{1k} = (\varepsilon_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_{z^-_{(k)}})'$, $\underline{y}_{2k} = (y_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_{z^+_{(k)}})'$, $\mathbf{X}_{2k} = (\underline{x}_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_{z^+_{(k)}})'$, $\underline{\varepsilon}_{2k} = (\varepsilon_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_{z^+_{(k)}})'$, $\boldsymbol{W}_{1k} = diag((w_{[r_{y_i,\mathcal{I}_{z^-_{(k)}}}]}, i \in \mathcal{I}_{z^-_{(k)}}))$, $\boldsymbol{W}_{2k} = diag((w_{[r_{y_i,\mathcal{I}_{z^+_{(k)}}}]}, i \in \mathcal{I}_{z^+_{(k)}}))$, $Q_1(k, \underline{\beta}) = Q(z^-_{(k)}, \underline{\beta}))$ and $Q_2(k, \underline{\beta}) = Q(z^+_{(k)}, \underline{\beta}))$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{\hat{\beta}}_{1k} &= \arg\min_{\underline{\beta}} Q_1(k, \underline{\beta}) = (\mathbf{X}'_{1k}\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}\mathbf{X}_{1k})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'_{1k}\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}\underline{y}_{1k} \\
\underline{\hat{\beta}}_{2k} &= \arg\min_{\underline{\beta}} Q_2(k, \underline{\beta}) = (\mathbf{X}'_{2k}\boldsymbol{W}_{2k}\mathbf{X}_{2k})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'_{2k}\boldsymbol{W}_{2k}\underline{y}_{2k}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $k/n \to \tau'$, $k^*/n \to \tau$ (for example $k = \lfloor n\tau' \rfloor$, $k^* = \lfloor n\tau \rfloor$), $E(\underline{x}_i\underline{x}'_i | z_i \leq \varsigma) = \Sigma_{0,\varsigma^-}$

and $E(\underline{x}_i\underline{x}_i'|z_i > \varsigma) = \Sigma_{0,\varsigma^+}$. First we consider the case of $0 \le \tau' < \tau$. For $\sharp\mathcal{I}_{z_{(k)}^-} = k$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_1(k, \hat{\underline{\beta}}_{1k}) &= \frac{k}{n}(\underline{y}_{1k} - \mathbf{X}_{1k}\hat{\underline{\beta}}_{1k})'\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}(\underline{y}_{1k} - \mathbf{X}_{1k}\hat{\underline{\beta}}_{1k}) \\
&= \frac{k}{n}\underline{y}_{1k}'\left(I_k - \boldsymbol{W}_{1k}\mathbf{X}_{1k}(\mathbf{X}_{1k}'\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}\mathbf{X}_{1k})^{-1}\mathbf{X}_{1k}'\right) \\
&\quad \boldsymbol{W}_{1k}\left(I_k - \mathbf{X}_{1k}(\mathbf{X}_{1k}'\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}\mathbf{X}_{1k})^{-1}\mathbf{X}_{1k}\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}\right)\underline{y}_{1k} \\
&= \frac{k}{n}\underline{\varepsilon}_{1k}'\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}^{1/2}(I_k - \boldsymbol{W}_{1k}^{1/2}\mathbf{X}_{1k}(\mathbf{X}_{1k}'\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}\mathbf{X}_{1k})^{-1}\mathbf{X}_{1k}'\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}^{1/2})\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}^{1/2}\underline{\varepsilon}_{1k} \\
&= \frac{k}{n}\underline{\varepsilon}_{1k}'\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}\underline{\varepsilon}_{1k} - \frac{k}{n}\underline{\varepsilon}_{1k}'\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}\mathbf{X}_{1k}(\mathbf{X}_{1k}'\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}\mathbf{X}_{1k})^{-1}\mathbf{X}_{1k}'\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}\underline{\varepsilon}_{1k}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 1.8 of Stute (1993) and z_i, ε_i are independent,

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{\varepsilon}_{1k}'\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}\underline{\varepsilon}_{1k} &= \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_{z_{(k)}^-}} w_{[r_{y_i},\mathcal{I}_{z_{(k)}^-}]}(y_i - \underline{x}_i'\underline{\beta}_1^*)^2 \to_{a.s.} E[(y_i - \underline{x}_i'\underline{\beta}_1^*)^2|z_i \le z_{(k)}] = E\varepsilon_i^2 = \sigma_1^2, \\
\mathbf{X}_{1k}'\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}\mathbf{X}_{1k} &= \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_{z_{(k)}^-}} w_{[r_{y_i},\mathcal{I}_{z_{(k)}^-}]}\underline{x}_i\underline{x}_i' \to_{a.s.} E(\underline{x}_i\underline{x}_i'|z_i \le z_{(k)}) = \Sigma_{0,z_{(k)}^-} \le \Sigma_0, \\
\underline{\varepsilon}_{1k}'\boldsymbol{W}_{1k}\mathbf{X}_{1k} &= \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}_{z_{(k)}^-}} w_{[r_{y_i},\mathcal{I}_{z_{(k)}^-}]}\varepsilon_i\underline{x}_i' \to_{a.s.} E(\varepsilon_i\underline{x}_i'|z_i \le z_{(k)}) = E[E(\varepsilon_i\underline{x}_i'|\underline{x}_i, z_i \le z_{(k)})] = \underline{0}_p'.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$Q_1(k, \hat{\underline{\beta}}_{1k}) \to_{a.s.} \tau'\sigma_1^2. \tag{A.5}$$

Let $\underline{d}^* = \underline{\beta}_2^* - \underline{\beta}_1^*$, $\underline{t}_{2k} = (t_{k+1}, \ldots, t_n)'$,$\mathbf{0}_{kk^*} = \mathbf{0}_{(k^*-k)\times(p+1)}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{2k^*} = (\underline{x}_{k^*+1}, \ldots, \underline{x}_n)'$. We have

$$\underline{t}_{2k} = \mathbf{X}_{2k}\underline{\beta}_1^* + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{kk^*} \\ \mathbf{X}_{2k^*} \end{pmatrix}\underline{d}^* + \underline{\varepsilon}_{2k}.$$

Notice that $\sharp\mathcal{I}_{z^+_{(k)}} = n-k$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_2(k,\hat{\underline{\beta}}_{2k}) &= \frac{n-k}{n}(\underline{y}_{2k}-\mathbf{X}_{2k}\hat{\underline{\beta}}_{2k})'\boldsymbol{W}_{2k}(\underline{y}_{2k}-\mathbf{X}_{2k}\hat{\underline{\beta}}_{2k}) \\
&= \frac{n-k}{n}\underline{y}'_{2k}\boldsymbol{W}_{2k}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{P}_{n-k}\boldsymbol{W}_{2k}^{1/2}\underline{y}_{2k} \\
&= \frac{n-k}{n}\underline{\varepsilon}'_{2k}\boldsymbol{W}_{2k}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{P}_{n-k}\boldsymbol{W}_{2k}^{1/2}\underline{\varepsilon}_{2k} \\
&\quad +\frac{n-k}{n}(\underline{d}^*)'\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{0}_{kk^*}\\ \mathbf{X}_{2k^*}\end{pmatrix}'\boldsymbol{W}_{2k}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{P}_{n-k}\boldsymbol{W}_{2k}^{1/2}\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{0}_{kk^*}\\ \mathbf{X}_{2k^*}\end{pmatrix}\underline{d}^* \\
&\quad +\frac{2(n-k)}{n}(\underline{d}^*)'\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{0}_{kk^*}\\ \mathbf{X}_{2k^*}\end{pmatrix}'\boldsymbol{W}_{2k}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{P}_{n-k}\boldsymbol{W}_{2k}^{1/2}\underline{\varepsilon}_{2k}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{P}_{n-k} = I_{n-k} - \boldsymbol{W}_{2k}^{1/2}\mathbf{X}_{2k}(\mathbf{X}'_{2k}\boldsymbol{W}_{2k}\mathbf{X}_{2k})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'_{2k}\boldsymbol{W}_{2k}^{1/2}$.

Recall that $k/n \to \tau', k^*/n \to \tau, 0 \le \tau' < \tau$. Let $\alpha_{1k} = \lim_{n\to\infty}(k^*-k)/(n-k) = (\tau-\tau')/(1-\tau')$. In the following proof, we can consider that $\{t_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_{z^+_{(k)}}\}$ are independent samples with the same mixture distribution as $\tilde{F}_k = \alpha_{1k}F_1 + (1-\alpha_{1k})F_2$. Let the distribution of $y_i = \min\{t_i, c_i\}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}_{z^+_{(k)}}$ be $\tilde{H}_k$. By (A2),

$$\begin{aligned}
1-\tilde{H}_k(y) &= (1-\tilde{F}_k(y))(1-G(y)) \\
&= \alpha_{1k}(1-F_1(y))(1-G(y)) + (1-\alpha_{1k})(1-F_2(y))(1-G(y)) \\
&= \alpha_{1k}(1-H_1(y)) + (1-\alpha_{1k})(1-H_2(y)),
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $y_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_{z^+_{(k)}}$ are independent samples with the same mixture distribution $\tilde{H}_k(y) = \alpha_{1k}H_1(y) + (1-\alpha_{1k})H_2(y)$.

Let $\tilde{\underline{\beta}}^* = \underline{\beta}_1^* 1_{\{T \stackrel{d}{=} F_1\}} + \underline{\beta}_2^* 1_{\{T \stackrel{d}{=} F_2\}}$. By Corollary 1.8 of Stute (1993), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{\varepsilon}_{2k}' \boldsymbol{W}_{2k} \underline{\varepsilon}_{2k} &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{z_{(k)}^+}} w_{[r_{y_i, \mathcal{I}_{z_{(k)}^+}}]} (y_i - \underline{x}_i' \tilde{\underline{\beta}}^*)^2 \\
&\to_{a.s.} E[(t_i - \underline{x}_i' \tilde{\underline{\beta}}^*)^2 | z_i > z_{(k)}] = \alpha_{1k} \sigma_1^2 + (1 - \alpha_{1k}) \sigma_2^2, \\
\mathbf{X}_{2k}' \boldsymbol{W}_{2k} \mathbf{X}_{2k} &\to_{a.s.} E(\underline{x}_i \underline{x}_i' | z_i > z_{(k)}) = \Sigma_{0, z_{(k)}^+} \leq \Sigma_0, \\
\underline{\varepsilon}_{2k}' \boldsymbol{W}_{2k} \mathbf{X}_{2k} &\to_{a.s.} E(\varepsilon_i \underline{x}_i' | z_i > z_{(k)}) = \underline{0}_p'.
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 1 of Stute (1993), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{X}_{2k}' \boldsymbol{W}_{2k} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{kk^*} \\ \mathbf{X}_{2k^*} \end{pmatrix} \underline{d}^* &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{z_{(k^*)}^+}} w_{[r_{y_i, \mathcal{I}_{z_{(k)}^+}}]} \underline{x}_i \underline{x}_i' \underline{d}^* \\
&= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{z_{(k)}^+}} w_{[r_{y_i, \mathcal{I}_{z_{(k)}^+}}]} \underline{x}_i \underline{x}_i' 1_{\{T_i \stackrel{d}{=} F_2\}} \underline{d}^* \\
&\to_{a.s.} E[(\underline{x}_i \underline{x}_i' 1_{\{T_i \stackrel{d}{=} F_2\}}) | z_i > z_{(k^*)}] \underline{d}^* = (1 - \alpha_{1k}) \Sigma_{0, z_{(k^*)}^+} \underline{d}^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$(\underline{d}^*)' \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{kk^*} \\ \mathbf{X}_{2k^*} \end{pmatrix}' \boldsymbol{W}_{2k} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{kk^*} \\ \mathbf{X}_{2k^*} \end{pmatrix} \underline{d}^* = (\underline{d}^*)' \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{z_{(k^*)}^+}} w_{[r_{y_i, \mathcal{I}_{z_{(k)}^+}}]} \underline{x}_i \underline{x}_i' \underline{d}^* \to_{a.s.} (1 - \alpha_{1k}) (\underline{d}^*)' \Sigma_{0, z_{(k^*)}^+} \underline{d}^*,$$

$$(\underline{d}^*)' \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{ka_n} \\ \mathbf{X}_{2k^*} \end{pmatrix}' \boldsymbol{W}_{2k} \underline{\varepsilon}_{2k} = (\underline{d}^*)' \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{z_{(k^*)}^+}} w_{[r_{y_i, \mathcal{I}_{z_{(k)}^+}}]} \underline{x}_i \varepsilon_i \to_{a.s.} (1 - \alpha_{1k}) (\underline{d}^*)' E(\underline{x}_i \varepsilon_i | z_i > z_{(k^*)}) = 0.$$

Thus

$$Q_2(k, \hat{\beta}_{2k}) \to_{a.s.} (\tau - \tau') \sigma_1^2 + (1 - \tau) \sigma_2^2 + \frac{(1 - \tau)(\tau - \tau')}{1 - \tau'} (\underline{d}^*)' \Sigma_{0, z_{(k^*)}^+} \underline{d}^*. \tag{A.6}$$

Combined (A.5) and (A.6), if $0 \leq \tau' < \tau$, we have, with probability 1,

$$Q(z_{(k)}) \to \tau \sigma_1^2 + (1 - \tau) \sigma_2^2 + (1 - \tau)(\tau - \tau')(1 - \tau')^{-1} (\underline{d}^*)' \Sigma_{0, z_{(k^*)}^+} \underline{d}^* > \tau \sigma_1^2 + (1 - \tau) \sigma_2^2.$$

Similarly, if $1 \geq \tau' > \tau$, with probability 1, we can obtain

$$Q(z_{(k)}) \to \tau\sigma_1^2 + (1-\tau)\sigma_2^2 + \tau(\tau'-\tau)\tau'^{-1}(\underline{d}^*)'\Sigma_{0,z_{(k^*)}^-}\underline{d}^* > \tau\sigma_1^2 + (1-\tau)\sigma_2^2,$$

and $Q(z_{(k^*)}) \to_{a.s.} \tau\sigma_1^2 + (1-\tau)\sigma_2^2$. Thus if $\hat{a} = \arg\min_{\varsigma\in\{z_{(1)},\ldots,z_{(n)}\}}\{Q(\varsigma)\} = z_{(\hat{k})}$, we have $\hat{k}/n \to_{a.s} \tau$, i.e., $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n 1_{\{z_i\leq\hat{a}\}} \to_{a.s} \tau$. If z_i is a continuous random variable, by continuous mapping theorem, we have $\hat{a} \to_{a.s.} a$. Therefore, the proof is complete.

Proof of Theorem 3.2

By the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions, we only need to show in probability,

$$\max_{j\notin\mathcal{A}} ||n^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(j)})'(\underline{\tilde{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}\underline{\hat{\theta}}_{\mathcal{A}^*})|| \leq \sqrt{p}\lambda_n \tag{A.7}$$

$$\min_{\ell=1,\ldots,s}\{\|\underline{\hat{\theta}}_1\|, \max\{\|\underline{\hat{\theta}}_{k_{\ell,n}}\|, \|\underline{\hat{\theta}}_{k_{\ell,n}+1}\|\}\} \geq \sqrt{p}\gamma\lambda_n. \tag{A.8}$$

First, we prove (A.7). Note that α_j is arbitrary in (A.4). By the condition (A7) and (A8), we put $\alpha_j = 1$ if $k_{j,n} \in \mathcal{A}^*$ and $k_{j,n}+1 \notin \mathcal{A}^*$, and we put $\alpha_j = 0$ if $k_{j,n} \notin \mathcal{A}^*$ and $k_{j,n}+1 \in \mathcal{A}^*$. Thus, (A.4) can be rewritten as

$$\underline{\tilde{y}} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}\underline{\tilde{\theta}}^*_{\mathcal{A}^*} + \underline{\tilde{x}}_\omega + \underline{\tilde{\varepsilon}}.$$

By $\underline{\hat{\theta}}_{\mathcal{A}^*} = (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{\mathcal{A}^*}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*})^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}\underline{\tilde{y}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(j)})'(\underline{\tilde{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}\underline{\hat{\theta}}_{\mathcal{A}^*})\| \\
= \; & \|(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(j)})'(I_n - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{\mathcal{A}^*}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*})^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*})\underline{\tilde{y}}\| \\
= \; & \|(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(j)})'(I_n - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{\mathcal{A}^*}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*})^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*})(\underline{\tilde{x}}_\omega + \underline{\tilde{\varepsilon}})\| \\
\leq \; & \|(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(j)})'(\underline{\tilde{x}}_\omega + \underline{\tilde{\varepsilon}})\| \leq \|(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(j)})'\underline{\tilde{x}}_\omega\| + \|(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(j)})'\underline{\tilde{\varepsilon}}\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where since $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{\mathcal{A}^*}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*})^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}$ is a projection matrix, the first inequality comes from Theorem 2.22 of Puntanen (2011), and the second inequality comes from triangle inequality.

By the definition of $\underline{\omega}_i$, with probability 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_j \|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(j)})'\underline{\tilde{x}}_\omega\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{q_n+1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(j)}\underline{\tilde{x}}_{\omega,(j)}\| \\
&\leqslant \sum_{\ell=1}^{s} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^{(1)}_{k_{\ell,n}}} \underline{\tilde{x}}_i\tilde{\underline{x}}'_i(-\alpha_\ell)\underline{\delta}^*_\ell + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}^{(2)}_{k_{\ell,n}}} \underline{\tilde{x}}_i\tilde{\underline{x}}^T_i(1-\alpha_\ell)\underline{\delta}^*_\ell \right\| \\
\leqslant\ & \sum_{\ell=1}^{s} \|\underline{\delta}^*_\ell\| \|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(k_{\ell,n})}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{(k_{\ell,n})}\| \leqslant \frac{s\max_\ell \sharp\mathcal{I}_{k_{\ell,n}}}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma_0\| \max_{1\leqslant\ell\leqslant s} \|\underline{d}^*_\ell\| .
\end{aligned}$$

By (A4), we have $\frac{\max_\ell \sharp\mathcal{I}_{k_{\ell,n}}}{\sqrt{n}} = O(1)$. Thus $\max_j \|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(j)})'\underline{\tilde{x}}_\omega\|$ is bounded with probability 1.

Assume $\underline{\varphi}_j(\underline{X}, Y) = \underline{X}'(Y - \underline{X}'\beta^*_j)$. By (A6), $\underline{\varphi}_j = 0$ for all $Y \in (\tau^*_{F_j} + \tau_{E_j}, \tau_{F_j}]$ which is the condition (2.3) of Stute (1995). From (A1), we have $E\|\underline{\varphi}_j\|^2 < \infty$. Denote $\underline{\tilde{x}}_t = (\tilde{x}_{t,1}, \ldots, \tilde{x}_{t,p})'$. By (2.5) in Stute (1995). we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\sharp\mathcal{I}_j}} \sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_j} \tilde{x}_{t,i}\tilde{\varepsilon}_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sharp\mathcal{I}_j}} \sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_j} U_{j,i,t} + R_{j,i}, \tag{A.9}$$

where the $U_{j,i,t}, t \in \mathcal{I}_j$ are i.i.d. with mean zero and $V_{j,i} = Var(U_{j,i,t}) < \infty$, and

$$|R_{j,i}| = O_{a.s.}\left((\sharp\mathcal{I}_j)^{-1/2}\log(\sharp\mathcal{I}_j)\right).$$

The expression of $V_{j,i}$ can be seen in Theorem 1.1 of Stute (1996).

Because there are $s+1$ difference models in each of which T_ℓ has the distribution $F_\ell, \ell = 1, \ldots, s+1$, and by $a_\ell \in \mathcal{I}_{k_{\ell,n}}, \ell = 1, \ldots, s$, for all $V_{j,i}$, $j \in [k_{\ell-1,n}+1, k_{\ell,n}-1]$

have the same value and set $V_{j,i} = V^*_{\ell,i}$ for all $j \in [k_{\ell-1,n}+1, k_{\ell,n}-1]$, $\ell = 1, \ldots, s+1$, where $k_{0,n} = 0, k_{s+1,n} = q_n + 2$. Assume $\sharp\mathcal{I}^{(1)}_{k_{\ell,n}}/\sharp\mathcal{I}_{k_{\ell,n}} \to \alpha_\ell$, and then we can consider that $\{t_i, i \in \mathcal{I}_{k_{\ell,n}}\}$ are independent samples with the same mixture distribution as $\tilde{F}_\ell = \alpha_\ell F_\ell + (1-\alpha_\ell)F_{\ell+1}$. Thus when $j = k_{\ell,n}$, $V_{j,i} = \tilde{V}_{\ell,i} = \alpha_\ell V^*_{\ell,i} + (1-\alpha_\ell)V^*_{\ell+1,i}$, $\ell = 1, \ldots, s$. Therefore $V_{j,i}, j = 1, \ldots, q_n+1, i = 1, \ldots, p$ have at most $(2s+1)p$ different value and we define the max value from these value as V.

By (A.9), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{1\le j\le q_n+1} \|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(j)})'\underline{\tilde{\varepsilon}}\| \\
\le\ & \sum_{i=1}^{p} \max_{1\leqslant k\leqslant q_n+1} |\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=k}^{q_n+1} \sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_j} \tilde{x}_{t,i}\tilde{\varepsilon}_t| \\
\le\ & \sum_{i=1}^{p} \max_{1\leqslant k\leqslant q_n+1} |\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=k}^{q_n+1} \sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_j} U_{j,i,t}| + \sum_{i=1}^{p}\sum_{j=1}^{q_n+1} \frac{\sqrt{\sharp\mathcal{I}_j}}{\sqrt{n}}|R_{j,i}|
\end{aligned}$$

For $n^* = O(n), q_n = O(m) = O(n^{1/2})$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{p}\sum_{j=1}^{q_n+1} \frac{\sqrt{\sharp\mathcal{I}_j}}{\sqrt{n}}|R_{j,i}| = O_{a.s.}(\log n)$.

By Hájek and Rényi inequality (Hájek and Rényi, 1995), for any given $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} P(\max_{1\leqslant k\leqslant q_n+1} |\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=k}^{q_n+1} \sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_j} U_{j,i,t}| \ge \epsilon \log n) \\
\le\ & \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2 n(\log n)^2} \sum_{j=1}^{q_n+1} \frac{\sharp\mathcal{I}_j}{n} V_{j,i} < \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{V}{\epsilon^2 n(\log n)^2} < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2.1 of Yang, Su and Yu (2008), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p} \max_{1\leqslant k\leqslant q_n+1} |\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=k}^{q_n+1} \sum_{t\in\mathcal{I}_j} U_{j,i,t}| = o_{a.s.}(\log n).$$

Combining the above result, we have $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\max_{j\notin\mathcal{A}}||(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(j)})'(\underline{\tilde{y}}-\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}\underline{\hat{\theta}}_{\mathcal{A}^*})|| = O_{a.s.}(\log n)$, but $\sqrt{n}\lambda_n/\log n\to\infty$, and then (A.7) holds with probability 1.

Let $\mathcal{A}^* = \{j_i, i = 1,\ldots,\hat{b}\}$ where $j_1 < j_2 < \ldots < j_{\hat{b}}$. By the condition (A7) and (A8), we have $j_1 = 1$ and $\hat{b}\le 2s+1$. Put $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{(c:d)} = (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(c)},\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(c+1)},\ldots,\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(d)})'$ and $\underline{\tilde{y}}_{(c:d)} = (\underline{\tilde{y}}'_{(c)},\underline{\tilde{y}}'_{(c+1)},\ldots,\underline{\tilde{y}}'_{(d)})'$ for $c\le d$, and $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_i = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(j_i:j_{i+1}-1)}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{((j_i:j_{i+1}-1)} = \sum_{k=j_i}^{j_{i+1}-1}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(k)}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{(k)}$, $i = 1,\ldots,\hat{b}$, $j_{\hat{b}+1} = q_n+2$. Then we have

$$\left(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{\mathcal{A}^*}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}\right)^{-1}$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_1^{-1} & -\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_1^{-1} & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_1^{-1} & \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_1^{-1}+\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_2^{-1} & -\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_2^{-1} & \ldots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & -\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{\hat{b}-2}^{-1} & \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{\hat{b}-2}^{-1}+\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{\hat{b}-1}^{-1} & -\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{b-1}^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & -\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{\hat{b}-1}^{-1} & \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{\hat{b}-1}^{-1}+\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{\hat{b}}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus

$$\underline{\hat{\theta}}_{\mathcal{A}^*} = \left(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{\mathcal{A}^*}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{A}^*}\right)^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{\mathcal{A}^*}\underline{\tilde{y}}_{\mathcal{A}^*} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_1^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(j_1:j_2-1)}\underline{\tilde{y}}_{(j_1:j_2-1)} \\ \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_2^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(j_2:j_3-1)}\underline{\tilde{y}}_{(j_2:j_3-1)} - \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_1^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(j_1:j_2-1)}\underline{\tilde{y}}_{(j_1:j_2-1)} \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{\hat{b}}^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(j_{\hat{b}}:j_{\hat{b}+1}-1)}\underline{\tilde{y}}_{(j_{\hat{b}}:j_{\hat{b}+1}-1)} - \tilde{\mathbb{X}}_{\hat{b}-1}^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}'_{(j_{\hat{b}-1}:j_{\hat{b}}-1)}\underline{\tilde{y}}_{(j_{\hat{b}-1}:j_{\hat{b}}-1)} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{(A.10)}$$

By (2.1), $m = \lfloor c\sqrt{n^*}\rfloor$ and (A.10), we have the following results:

1. $\underline{\hat{\theta}}_1 \to_{a.s.} \underline{\beta}_1^*$,
2. If $k_{j,n}\in\mathcal{A}^*$ and $k_{j+1,n}\notin\mathcal{A}^*$, $\underline{\hat{\theta}}_{k_{j,n}} \to_{a.s.} \underline{d}_j^*$,
3. If $k_{j,n}\notin\mathcal{A}^*$ and $k_{j+1,n}\in\mathcal{A}^*$, $\underline{\hat{\theta}}_{k_{j+1,n}} \to_{a.s.} \underline{d}_j^*$,

4. If $k_{j,n} \in \mathcal{A}^*$ and $k_{j+1,n} \in \mathcal{A}^*$, $\underline{\hat{\theta}}_{k_{j,n}} + \underline{\hat{\theta}}_{k_{j+1,n}} \rightarrow_{a.s.} \underline{d}_j^*$.

By the assume $\min\{||\beta_1||_2, ||\delta_j||_2\} > 2\sqrt{p}\gamma\lambda$, (A.8) holds with probability 1. Hence the proof of Theorem 3.2 is complete.

Proof of Theorem 3.3

The result (i) can be proved by Theorem 3.1. Under the Assumption (A7), the criterion

$$\frac{1}{2n}\|\tilde{\underline{y}}_{(\underline{a})} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{(\underline{a})}\underline{\theta}\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{(s+1)p} p_{\lambda_n,\gamma}(|\theta_i|)$$

is strictly convex. By the KKT condition and result (i), (ii) holds with probability 1 in the following events

$$\max_{j \notin S} |n^{-1}(\tilde{\underline{x}}_j)'(\tilde{\underline{y}}_S - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_S\hat{\underline{\theta}}_S^o)| \leq \lambda_n \text{ and } \min_{j \in S}\{\|\hat{\theta}_j^o\|\} \geq \gamma\lambda_n.$$

which can be proven similarly as the proof of Theorem 3.2. Hence the proof is complete.

References

Bai, J. and Perron, P. (2003), Computation and Analysis of Multiple Structural Change Models, *Journal of Applied Econometric*, 18, 1-22.

Buckley, J. and James, I. (1979), Linear regression with censored data, *Biometrika*, 66, 429-436.

Dave, S. S., Wright, G., Tan, B., Rosenwald, A., Gascoyne, R. D., Chan, W. C., ... Staudt, L. M. (2004), Prediction of survival in follicular lymphoma based on molecular features of tumor-infiltrating immune cells, *New England Journal of Medicine*, 351, 2159-2169.

Davis, R. A., Lee, T. C. M., Rodriguez-Yam, G. A. (2006), Structural break estimation for nonstationary time series models, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101, 223-239.

Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001), Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96, 1348-1360.

Fearnhead, P. and Vasileiou, D. (2009), Bayesian Analysis of Isochores, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104, 132-141.

Hansen, B. E. (2000), Sample splitting and threshold estimation, *Econometrica*,68, 575-603.

Harchaoui, Z. and Lévy-Leduc, C. (2010), Multiple Change-Point Estimation With a Total Variation Penalty, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105, 1480-1493.

Huang, J., Ma, S. and Xie, H. (2006), Regularized estimation in the accelerated failure time model with high-dimensional covariates, *Biometrics*, 62, 813-820.

Inclan, C., and Tiao, G. C. (1994), Use of cumulative sums of squares for retrospective detection of changes of variance , *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89, 913-923.

Jin, B., Shi, X. and Wu, Y. (2013), A novel and fast methodology for simultaneous multiple structural break estimation and variable selection for nonstationary time series models, *Statistics and Computing*, 23,221-231.

Lawless, J. F. (2011), *Statistical models and methods for lifetime data*, John Wiley& Sons.

Lin, D. Y., Wei, L. J. and Ying, Z. (1998), Accelerated failure time models for counting processes, *Biometrika*, 85, 605-618.

Perron, P. (2006), *Dealing with Structural Breaks, in Palgrave Handbook of Econometrics*, Vol. 1: Econometric Theory, K. Patterson and T.C. Mills (eds.), Palgrave Macmillan, 278-352.

Prentice, R. L. (1978), Linear rank test with right censored data, *Biometrika*, 65, 167-179.

Puntanen, S. (2011), Projection Matrices, Generalized Inverse Matrices, and Singular Value Decomposition by Haruo Yanai, Kei Takeuchi, Yoshio Takane. *International Statistical Review*, 79, 503-504.

Stute, W. (1993), Consistent estimation under random censorship when covariables are present, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 45,89-103.

Stute, W. (1995), The central limit theorem under random censorship, *The Annals of Statistics*, 23,422-439.

Stute, W. (1996), Distributional convergence under random censorship when covariables are present, *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 23,461-471.

Tibshirani, R. (1996), Regression Shrinkage and Selection via the lasso, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Series B, 58, 267-288.

Tong, H. (2012), *Threshold models in non-linear time series analysis.* Springer Science & Business Media.

Tsiatis, A. A. (1990), Estimating regression parameters using linear rank tests for censored data, *The Annals of Statistics*, 18, 354-372.

Yang, S., Su, C. and Yu, K. (2008), A general method to the strong law of lage numbers and its applications, *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 78, 794-803.

Yao, Y., and Au, S. T. (1989), Least-Squares Estimation of a Step Function, *Sankhyō: The Indian Journal of Statistics*, Series A, **51**, 370-381.

Ying, Z. (1993), A large sample study of rank estimation for censored regression data, *The Annals of Statistics*, 21, 76-99.

Yu, T., Li, J. and Ma, S. (2012), Adjusting confounders in ranking biomarkers:amodel-based ROC approach, *Briefings In Bioinformatics*, 13, 513-523.

Zhang, C. (2010), Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty, *The Annals of Statistics*, 38, 894-942.



Figure 2: Box plots of coefficients estimated from MCP (left) and SCAD (right). Results of examples 1, 2, and 3 are displayed in the three rows, respectively. Red $'*'$s are the true values.



Figure 3: Survival curves for the three groups separated by the two thresholds of Gene 357. + indicates a censored observation. Groups 1, 2 and 3 refer to $z \leq -0.482$, $-0.482 < z \leq 0.907$ and $z > 0.907$, respectively.